

1964

An examination of the life stories of the recipients of these awards, and of the contributions that they have made is, indeed, impressive. Here are found, in the work of these men and women, the very often for the benefit of all mankind, stories of significant contributions not only for the benefit of all Americans but

But it is only a few of the more outstanding employees in the Federal Service who can be so recognized. For every one who is, there are dozens, scores, hundreds, perhaps even thousands more who inconspicuously, day by day, perform their assigned tasks competently, efficiently, and with the high standards of integrity that characterize the Federal Civil Service.

It is a pleasure to salute them, and to commend the tremendous contribution which they make to the progress and wellbeing of our Nation.

U.S. SHOULD FIRE CUBAN EMPLOYEES AT GITMO

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, while France, England, Sweden, Spain and other "friends" and "allies" of the United States ready all sorts of economic aid for Castro, the Cuban dictator himself has decided to create more mischief in the Caribbean.

Perhaps to take advantage of the difficult Panama problem, or for other reasons, Castro decided to willfully test U.S. resolve by sending four fishing boats into Florida territorial waters contrary to the law. If we had been looking the other way, as we have too often done in the past, he would have become even more bold the next time. However, the Coast Guard and State Department determined this time to board the trawlers, and caught them in the act of fishing in Florida waters.

Castro, reacting to our legal detention of the fishing boats and crew, cut off the water supply to our naval base in Cuba. Fortunately this event has been long expected, and water will be carried to the base from Port Everglades, Fla. This port has been equipped for this job for some time, and is ready for action now that it is needed. The people of Fort Lauderdale and Hollywood, home of the port, will cooperate fully with the Navy.

For years the United States has employed Cuban workers at the naval base. Even during the ill-fated invasion attempt, and later missile crisis, these employees continued to enter and leave the base daily.

These employees are paid in American dollars, which of course ends up in Castro's hands.

There is no further need for hiring Cubans to work on the base. With unemployment so high in the United States, it would be worth the extra cost to recruit American citizens in this country for the jobs to be done, and take them to the base.

This of course is not just suggested as a counter move because of the water

cut-off. There are serious security problems with the Cuban nationals now working on the base which should be eliminated. We should also completely halt the flow of U.S. dollars to Castro via these workers.

Castro has now taken two steps against the United States. He has sent his fishing fleet into our waters illegally, and has cut off the water to our base. Perhaps those who still believe we can live with Castro in the Caribbean will realize that it is impossible. Perhaps, also, our "allies" will better understand the need for a complete economic blockade of Cuba, or even more stringent measures.

As to the trawlers themselves and their crew, they were caught violating the territorial waters of the United States, in violation of the law. They have been turned over to the State of Florida for legal action against them, and nothing should interfere with the due process of law.

GOV. NELSON ROCKEFELLER ISSUES THOUGHTFUL AND THOUGHT-PROVOKING WHITE PAPER ON VIETNAM

(Mr. SCHWENGEL asked and was permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, many American families are deeply concerned about the deteriorating situation in Vietnam. Judging by the mail and comments I am receiving from the people of the First District of Iowa, there is increasing disquiet about the lack of constructive national administration policies in this area. Because of the importance of Vietnam to the defense of free countries in Asia, Gov. Nelson Rockefeller of New York has prepared a white paper on the subject. It covers:

First. The neutralization of Laos.

Second. How the war in Vietnam is going: the process of "news management."

Third. The withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Vietnam.

Fourth. Understanding the nature of guerrilla war.

Fifth. The future of Cambodia and the rest of southeast Asia.

Because I believe very deeply that in order to save freedom in Asia, the United States must take intelligent, positive actions. I think Governor Rockefeller's white paper on Vietnam raises many important questions which all of us should be thinking about. It also provides useful guideposts in building a better foreign policy position for the people of the United States. It is another example of a leading Republican voice speaking out on foreign policy problems of our Nation and offering good proposals for tackling them.

STATEMENT BY GOVERNOR ROCKEFELLER AT A PRESS CONFERENCE IN LOS ANGELES, CALIF., WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 29, 1964

I am deeply troubled, as are many Americans, by the statement of Secretary McNamara 2 days ago on the serious deterioration

of the situation in South Vietnam, and then his apparently contradictory statement yesterday that there has been a very noticeable improvement recently.

The problem is one that not only affects Vietnam, but involves all southeast Asia. And in this area, the Democratic administration in Washington has pursued policies toward Laos, Cambodia and Vietnam utterly at variance with each other, despite the fact that the fate of these countries has been historically and geographically linked.

Ever since the present administration came to power in 1961, there have been conflicting statements about southeast Asia—statements which have raised hopes one day only to dash them the next.

It is time for the administration to give the American people a full accounting of the situation in Vietnam and southeast Asia.

Specifically, the administration should address itself to the following questions:

1. What are the actual facts on the war in South Vietnam?

2. What American military commitment is necessary to win the war?

3. Does the United States still intend to withdraw all its military forces from Vietnam by the end of 1965?

4. If the war was not going well, why were 1,000 American troops withdrawn in December 1963?

5. If the war in Vietnam has not been going well, how does the administration explain the optimistic statements extending well over 2 years?

6. Will the United States take any action to counteract the Communist violations of the international neutralization agreement for Laos?

7. In view of the history of Laos since its neutralization, would the United States be justified in participating in the international neutralization of Cambodia with the same countries that are violating the previous agreement?

8. How does the administration propose to reconcile the neutralization of Laos and the imminent neutralization of Cambodia with the effort to defeat the Communists in Vietnam?

9. How should we interpret Attorney General Robert Kennedy's statement in connection with his negotiations regarding Malaysia to the effect that Indonesian aggression was a problem for Asians to settle? Does this foreshadow additional abandonment of friends or neutralization in southeast Asia? What would our American reaction be if Great Britain, which has a defensive alliance with Malaysia, took the same attitude toward our military effort in Vietnam?

To give perspective to these questions, I want to specify my own concerns in greater detail, drawing as much as possible on the administration's own statement on Vietnam and southeast Asia.

I. THE NEUTRALIZATION OF LAOS

In 1961 when the Democratic administration took office, the United States was backing a pro-Western government in Laos. The Communist Pathet Lao controlled only one-fifth of the area. On March 23, 1961, in the face of a Communist advance, the President announced that the "safety (of Laos) runs with the safety of us all." U.S. troops moved into the Gulf of Siam.

When the Communists continued their advance, despite our show of strength, the administration came up with a scheme for the neutralization of Laos. It abandoned our support for the pro-Western Government of Phoumi Nosavan and insisted on a coalition government in which the Communists play an increasingly powerful part. Since the so-called neutralization the Communists have constantly expanded the area they control. Today the Communist Pathet Lao con-

trol over half of Laos, including the entire area contiguous to the Vietnamese border, extending over 260 miles, thus opening up a new supply line and a sanctuary for the Communist guerrillas in Vietnam.

In December 1961, while Laos was being neutralized, the United States formally committed itself to a major effort to defeat the Vietcong guerrillas. Over 10,000 military personnel were sent to Vietnam as instructors. Military assistance was stepped up. It was announced that Vietnam was different from Laos.

The "neutralization" of Laos was inconsistent with our Vietnam policy on two counts: psychologically, it spurred on the Vietcong (Communist guerrillas) and demoralized our friend. It set the precedent that we were capable of sacrificing a government we had been instrumental in establishing. It thus must have created the hope in some, and the fear in others, that if the war in Vietnam was sufficiently prolonged, we would tire of it as we had in Laos.

Militarily, the so-called "neutralization" of Laos opened up the entire frontier between Laos and Vietnam to guerrilla infiltration and enabled the Communists to establish sanctuaries in Laos, and new supply lines into Vietnam.

These supply lines have strengthened the Vietcong in their unending war of harassment.

II. HOW THE WAR IN VIETNAM IS GOING: THE PROCESS OF "NEWS MANAGEMENT"

Secretary McNamara now tells us that the war in Vietnam is going badly. Until recently the administration has apparently made every effort to hide this face from the American people. Thus:

On July 24, 1962, Secretary of Defense McNamara said that the South Vietnamese were "beginning to hit the Vietcong insurgents where it hurts most—in winning the people to the side of the government."

On April 5, 1963, General Taylor testified that "in the bitter struggle in the Republic of Vietnam, 1962 was the critical year. For the first time in 15 years the people of Vietnam with our military assistance started winning instead of losing the fight to protect their freedom."

On April 12, 1963, Secretary of State Rusk said that "an important corner has been turned" in the war in Vietnam.

On September 25, 1963, Assistant Secretary of Defense Sylvester said that military events in Vietnam were "getting better and better" and that reports showed that the government was "rapidly approaching" militarily the point where the "goals set will be reached relatively shortly."

On October 2, 1963, a White House announcement stated that the war was going so well that 1,000 U.S. military personnel could be withdrawn before the end of this year and most of the remainder before the end of 1965.

On October 31, 1963, the day before the overthrow of the Diem regime, General Harkins, the commander of our forces in Vietnam, said that victory, in the sense that it applied to this kind of war, was only months away.

In other words, even before the overthrow of the Diem regime, the administration consistently maintained that we were winning the war in Vietnam. After the overthrow, these claims continued, if anything more strongly, because the new government was supposed to be more determined. Thus:

On November 20, 1963, high administration officials meeting in Hawaii reported that the war had taken a decided turn for the better and reaffirmed the withdrawal of 1,000 American troops by January 1.

On November 25, 1963, President Johnson was reported to have reaffirmed the policy for Vietnam, including the October 2 statement on the withdrawal of 1,000 troops before the end of 1963.

On December 3, 1963, the first of 1,000 U.S. servicemen were withdrawn from Vietnam.

Suddenly, after 2 years of extraordinary optimism over the military effort in Vietnam, after a coup d'etat which put in power a government described as significantly more capable of prosecuting the war, it appears that the war is going badly. The American people have now been getting reports that, in fact, all is not well in Vietnam:

The month following the coup d'etat on November 1 was the most disastrous of the year for the Vietnamese forces. Government casualties and losses ran higher than in any other month. The Vietcong staged about 3,100 military and sabotage and propaganda actions, a record total since the resumption of hostilities in 1958.

A high ranking officer from Washington has disclosed in Saigon that the situation in the Mekong Delta is, in fact, "rough—really rough."

Only 2 days ago, Secretary McNamara told the House Armed Services Committee that the South Vietnam war is going badly, that the situation is grave, and that the Communists have made considerable progress since the overthrow of Diem.

How are all these announcements to be reconciled? How can we withdraw troops when the war is going badly? What are the American people to believe? The cynicism of the "news management" of the administration is shown by a statement from an unnamed administration official quoted in the New York Times on October 14.

"I admit the press was sometimes lied to in Saigon in the past, but that does not mean that lying has continued and that official word can never be taken at face value."

The stakes in Vietnam are too crucial for such cynical treatment. The struggle to maintain the political and territorial integrity of the Republic of South Vietnam is of vital importance to the people of the United States and to free peoples everywhere. Our failure to defeat the Communist guerrilla movement in Vietnam can lead to the extension of communism throughout all of southeast Asia. Such failure in Vietnam could convince all surrounding countries, and many others elsewhere, that Communists, indeed, are the wave of the future. It could, as well, convince our most trusted allies that our leadership is ineffective—that we have neither the power nor the will to back up our word. All Americans have a special concern with the struggle in Vietnam because the lives of 15,000 American boys are involved daily in that country and 166 Americans have already died there. The American people are willing to make sacrifices necessary to defeat Communist aggression. But they are entitled to be told the truth.

III. THE WITHDRAWAL OF U.S. TROOPS FROM SOUTH VIETNAM

The same confusion exists in regard to our policy on the withdrawal of American troops. Thus:

On October 2 the White House announced that 1,000 U.S. military personnel would be withdrawn before the end of 1963 and most of the remainder before the end of 1965.

On November 14, the White House reduced the figure of 1,000 troops for immediate withdrawal to "several hundred."

On November 15, General Timmes, Chief of the U.S. Advisory Mission in Vietnam, spoke again of a plan to withdraw 1,000.

On November 25 the policy statement of October 2 was reaffirmed by President Johnson.

On December 3, a troop withdrawal was begun and apparently 1,000 U.S. servicemen have been withdrawn from Vietnam, reducing the American contingent to 15,000 men.

On December 20, key U.S. officials were reported as regarding the 1965 target date as unrealistic.

On December 22, Secretary McNamara pointedly ignored a press question about the 1965 deadline.

American people have a right to know how we could announce a troop withdrawal when, in fact the war is going badly. They are distressed to see it reported in the New York Times of December 20 that several key U.S. officials have expressed the feeling that the 1965 target date for the removal of American troops had been established merely for domestic political reasons.

The American people are also forced to wonder what the effect of the withdrawal of 1,000 American forces had been and will be on the morale of the anti-Communist Vietnamese—at a time when visible evidence of American support must seem to be of utmost importance.

IV. UNDERSTANDING THE NATURE OF GUERRILLA WAR

In September and October of 1963, the administration suddenly began to criticize the Diem regime publicly. It was suggested that the Diem government could not effectively prosecute the war. For example:

On September 8, an administration official was quoted as saying: "We cannot go on supporting a dictatorial regime that is different from communism only in name and in its international connections."

This attitude seemed strangely inconsistent with the uninterrupted exaltation of Diem by Secretary McNamara, who, for example, spoke as follows before the House Subcommittee on Foreign Operations on May 15, 1963:

"It is a near miracle, it seems to me, that Diem, one man, could have written the constitution, organized a new Government of that country, and in a period of less than 10 years, moved that country out of near feudalism into the modern world, more than trebled the educational system of the country, initiated an army, and brought some order to the country."

"Moreover, he has done this in the last few years under the severest form of subversive attack from the North Vietnamese and the Communists."

Nonetheless the new military junta was enthusiastically greeted with confidence that now the war effort would be stepped up.

But within little over 1 month many of the comments made about the Diem regime reappeared in connection with the new military junta. For example:

On December 8 an American military adviser in Vietnam was quoted as saying: "The great unanswered question is whether the new Government leaders are aware and are willing to accept the price it takes to win the war."

On December 14 U.S. officials in Saigon expressed concern to the press that the junta had failed to capitalize on its momentum from the coup, that there had been only minor reforms in the military effort, that there was a lack of a real effort to bring defectors into the Vietnamese Government. (After the coup d'etat, defections had apparently stopped completely, and then they had then returned only to the same rate as had been present under Diem; new military appointments of the junta were said to have disrupted the field forces.)

On December 23 we were told that the military junta had not shown the sense of urgency that some Western observers believed was required. One Washington official expressed his views toward the junta in these words: "We should have expected delays, but we cannot tolerate them very much longer. We need momentum. If we sit back, the situation may be lost."

On January 27, 1964, Secretary McNamara now confirmed that the war was going poorly since the overthrow of the Diem regime.

Has the administration not understood that certain problems in Vietnam are inherent in the nature of guerrilla warfare? Could

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

2445

it be making the Vietnamese Government scapegoats for its own overoptimism?

All the criticism of the Diem regime and now of its successor may have obscured these basic facts:

The Vietcong guerrillas are trained and supported from outside the country. From such a privileged sanctuary, guerrilla action can be indefinitely maintained.

The guerrillas have a telling advantage over the government forces in that they need fight only where they are superior, whereas the government forces cannot be strong everywhere.

Many South Vietnamese, threatened by death by the guerrillas are compelled to offer them support, whatever their real sympathies may be.

The morale and efficiency of the existing administration is one of the chief targets of any guerrilla movement. Through assassination or blackmail they eliminate or drive many of the most competent civil servants from office.

Unfortunately, these facts cannot be removed merely by a change of government.

V. THE FUTURE OF CAMBODIA AND THE REST OF SOUTHEAST ASIA

Cambodia is a significant barometer of the estimate of Southeast Asian leaders about the probable trends in their area. The ruler of that small country, however temperamental by our standards, has seen his people through many troubles and kept communism from his territory. At a time when Washington's claims of imminent victory in Vietnam were succeeding each other with great rapidity, the ruler of Cambodia pointed out that the war was going badly. He said that he would do his best to spare his people the fate of Vietnam.

Within days of the coup against Diem, Prince Sihanouk first demanded the withdrawal of American personnel from Cambodia and the end of all economic, cultural, and military aid. On November 20, a request to this effect was formally made. Prince Sihanouk has also requested an international conference, similar to the conference which signed the neutralization of Laos at Geneva, in order to elaborate a similar status for his own country. The United States has agreed to such a conference.

The reasons for this state of affairs seem apparent. In 1962, the U.S. Government sacrificed a pro-Western government in Laos to a military junta. The Government of Cambodia must have wondered whether the effect of American aid would be similar in its own country. It also seems likely that the Government of Cambodia concluded that the effort against the Communist Vietcong guerrillas in South Vietnam was doomed to failure.

The attitude of Cambodia compounds the problem of Vietnam. It opens up the last remaining frontier of Vietnam to Communist infiltration. The New York Times of January 5 has reported that, in fact, much of the heavy equipment for the Communist guerrillas reaches Vietnam through Cambodia.

In these circumstances, what is the purpose of the conference to neutralize Cambodia? Is it to legitimize that country as a sanctuary for the war in Vietnam as was the case with Laos? What is the sense of sitting down with the countries which daily violate the neutrality of Laos to define the same status for Cambodia?

Of course, the ruler of Cambodia is free to conduct any policy he chooses, including neutrality. The problem for the United States is whether to participate in defining a special international status for Cambodia.

If Cambodia is neutralized on the model of Laos, the political and psychological pressures on Vietnam are bound to grow. It will then be argued that the solution to the problems of South Vietnam is "neutrality"—

which under the "Geneva formula" would mean the takeover by communism in a measurable time. It is no accident that leaflets urging the neutralization of South Vietnam have begun to appear in that country in increasing numbers. It is high time that the United States clarified its policies on southeast Asia.

RESORTS FACED WITH DOUBLE-EDGED SWORD

(Mr. CLEVELAND (at the request of Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government wields a two-edged sword that cuts both ways when it deals with the hotel and motel industry. Uncle Sam is financing the construction of new and unneeded hotel space and at the same time stiffening regulations on existing and established hotels and motels. Imposition of minimum wage standards on this recreation-dependent industry could be a serious financial blow to areas like New Hampshire that depend upon tourists and their patronage.

Hotels and motels received a double-barreled attack from the Federal Government last year. They lost substantial revenue because of changes in Federal tax regulations regarding business expense deductions, and at the same time, the Federal Government through ARA was financing competitive new motel and hotel operations in an industry that had an average occupancy rate of only 61 percent. ARA, for example, financed construction in 1963 of a \$1,894,525 motor hotel in Detroit although the hotel occupancy rate in Detroit during 1962 was only 54 percent.

While Federal policies are encouraging unemployment in the hotel business, proposals are now being made to extend Federal minimum wage standards to hotels and motels. General minimum wages could cripple the resort industry, where many employees are students receiving besides tips and wages, a free vacation, meals, and lodging. Certainly increased unemployment could be the result if resorts have to close because of the financial pressure put on them from the unwise establishment of minimum wages.

The following article from the February 1 issue of the Hotel and Restaurant News states that the hotel-motel industry suffered last year its "worst year since the depression":

A.H. & M.A. YEAREND REPORT LABELS 1963 "WORST SINCE DEPRESSION" FOR INDUSTRY: HOTEL-MOTEL SALES OFF \$85 MILLION

NEW YORK, N.Y.—The hotel-motel industry in 1963 experienced its "worst year since the depression," according to the accounting firms which conduct independent financial surveys for the industry.

In its yearend report, the American Hotel & Motel Association announced that total sales for the Nation's 87,000 hotels and motels fell 3 percent from 1962, as gross income decreased by almost \$85 million from the \$2.8 billion total achieved last year.

Food and beverage sales, according to the report, dropped from 3 to 5 percent. Room occupancy, at 61 percent, slipped 1 percent from 1962, while room rates throughout the country remained unchanged.

Contributing to the generally unfavorable financial picture, according to A.H. & M.A. Executive Vice President Lawson A. Odde, were 1963 losses totaling \$25 million in hotel-motel telephone operations, and "the continued refusal of the Nation's telephone companies to do anything about it."

Mr. Odde also scored "an increasing tendency on the part of the Federal Government to pass laws and regulations which jeopardize the already dangerously thin profits in the innkeeping field."

To reverse the downward trend, he declared, the A.H. & M.A. is "pulling out all the stops." He cited more research, more promotion, strengthening educational programs, working closely with the U.S. Travel Service to increase the flow of visitors from abroad, and a host of projects designed to increase profits, raise guest satisfaction, and lower costs, as areas of association concentration.

Also speaking out in the A.H. & M.A. annual yearend report were Arthur J. Packard, chairman of the group's governmental affairs committee; George D. Johnson, telephone committee chairman, and senior vice president, Sheraton Corp.; and A.H. & M.A. President Roy Watson, Jr., who is also president and general manager of the Kahler Corp., Rochester, Minn.

Mr. Packard hit the "confusing set of (travel and entertainment) tax regulations" which have turned away convention and business trade, and declared that passage of proposed minimum wage legislation would "trigger a quick rise in unemployment and force many hotels and motels to close their doors."

Mr. Johnson indicated the association is presently mapping plans for a nationwide campaign to attempt to stem telephone operating losses, while President Watson expressed the belief that the industry would recover from its present doldrums, because "we have adopted an optimistic and enthusiastic outlook, we are enlarging our effort better to merchandise better facilities, and we are emphasizing again the essence of innkeeping—good service to the guest."

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE JAMES C. CLEVELAND OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

(Mr. STAFFORD (at the request of Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I call to the attention of the House, the recognition which my distinguished colleague and neighbor from the great State of New Hampshire, JAMES C. CLEVELAND, has received for his fine efforts to eliminate waste and discrimination in Government research activities. It is gratifying to place in the Record a resolution adopted on the part of the New Hampshire Optometric Association, in the course of its winter meeting, January 22, 1964:

Whereas Congressman JAMES C. CLEVELAND, of New Hampshire, has displayed a great capability as a member of the House Select Committee on Government Research; and

Whereas his concern for elimination of waste and discrimination in Government research activities will have inestimable value in future programs: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the New Hampshire Optometric Association at its winter meeting, January 22, 1964, unanimously expressed its commendation and thanks to Mr. CLEVELAND for his overall interest in providing research in general and his particular interest in improving the climate for providing the best

vision care for the American public by all disciplines.

THE SO-CALLED TAX REDUCTION BILL

(Mr. YOUNGER (at the request of Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a letter from one of our constituents in regard to the so-called tax reduction bill which was passed by the House and I would like to quote two paragraphs from that letter:

Thanks so much for the copy of H.R. 8363 on the proposed tax cut. You have gone out of your way to help me and it is greatly appreciated indeed.

I have computed my own 1963 tax bill, as well as a number of other retired people's for the same year, and find that in every instance, H.R. 8363 raises the tax, not reduces it. This sampling is a fair one and I think would be fairly close for the majority of the retired over 65.

This seems to prove what I have contended all the time, that this so-called tax reduction bill is going to impose real hardship on all retired people and instead of giving any relief it will increase the tax take out of their meager income.

COMPENSATION FOR SENECA INDIANS

(Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON (at the request of Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin) was granted permission to extend her remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, when the Congress of the United States voted to build the Kinzua Dam within the Allegany Indian Reservation in New York and Pennsylvania it tore into shreds the first treaty this country ever made. It was a treaty made between the Seneca Nation and the United States, signed on behalf of George Washington November 11, 1794. This action was reexamined by Thomas Jefferson March 17, 1802, when he stated that these lands shall remain the property of the Seneca and Onondago Nations forever unless they shall voluntarily relinquish or dispose of them. But the treaty was broken and some two-thirds or 20,000 acres of their best land taken to be flooded by this dam.

The least we can do now is to compensate as adequately as possible these people who built their homes, educated their children and owe no man a penny. I would like to compliment our colleague, the gentleman from Florida, Representative JAMES HALEY, and his Subcommittee on Indian Affairs for the great interest they have taken in this matter, also the House leadership for bringing up H.R. 1794 at this time. Incidentally, a very appropriate number was assigned this legislation for it was in 1794 that the treaty was signed with the Seneca Nation. It is my hope that the bill will be speedily enacted and that the Appropriations Committee will follow through with the necessary funds

so these truly wonderful people will have new homes in adequate time.

CUBA

(Mr. SHRIVER (at the request of Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, the cut-off by the Castro government of fresh water in to the U.S. naval base at Guantanamo Bay comes as no surprise. However, the action by the Communist dictator and the reaction by our Government demonstrates once again the need for a clarification of U.S. policy in regard to Cuba.

Last summer I accepted an invitation from the Secretary of the Navy to join with other Members of the House in an inspection and briefing at our great naval base at Guantanamo Bay. My foremost impression at that time, and it is the same today, is that the United States must under no circumstances relinquish or leave or give up this excellent naval base. It is important to the security of this Nation as an ideal training station for our fleet. It is strategically located for protection of the Panama Canal, in fact the sea routes to the Caribbean and Latin America. It is vital to the maintenance of American sea and air power.

While we are concerned about the cut-off of the water supply at the moment, the Castro government, assisted by Soviet military troops and technicians in Cuba, could aim a greater blow at that vital base.

On January 18, 1964, Radio Progreso broadcast from Havana a special message sent from Premier Khrushchev and Castro while the latter was in Moscow. The Soviet Premier was quoted as follows:

We salute the peoples that fight for their liberation, those who are good fighters, and we wish them complete success in this fight * * * we salute the battle of the Cuban people for the liquidation of the Guantanamo military base * * * the soil of Guantanamo is Cuban soil and must be returned to Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, we can expect new incidents in the Caribbean. Castro, with Soviet backing, will continue to flex his muscles and intimidate the United States until the administration displays the firmness and determination which Communists understand best.

A CERTAIN RICH MAN

(Mr. SNYDER (at the request of Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, it is time that someone called President Johnson's attention to another approach to his "help poverty" program, where he has the opportunity to perform.

Two thousand years ago our Lord Jesus Christ applied such reasoning to another ruler, as described in the Gospel according to St. Luke, beginning with the 18th verse:

And a certain ruler asked him, saying, Good Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life?

And Jesus said unto him, Why callest thou me good? none is good, save one, that is, God.

Thou knowest the Commandments, Do not commit adultery, Do not kill, Do not steal, Do not bear false witness, Honor thy father and thy mother.

And he said, All these have I kept from my youth up.

Now when Jesus heard these things, he said unto him, Yet lacketh thou one thing: sell all that thou hast, and distribute unto the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come, follow me.

And when he heard this, he was very sorrowful: for he was very rich.

If President Johnson should give away his millions to the poor it still wouldn't make much of a dent in poverty. But, if he did give away his considerable fortune to the poor, it would prove that he did sincerely mean his "help poverty" program: it would dispell the idea that he is currently delighted to help the poor by giving away other peoples' money.

"Charity begins at home" is a true proverb.

It is true for those who give as well as for those who get.

FEDERAL SUBSIDIES MAY EXCEED TOTAL COST OF FACILITIES PROVIDED BY DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AS NONCASH GRANTS-IN-AID, GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE FINDS

(Mr. KYL (at the request of Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the bill, S. 628, which is now before the House Committee on the District of Columbia. The purpose of this bill, according to its proponents, is to permit urban renewal in downtown Washington, while the General Accounting Office and the American Law Division of the Library of Congress insist it would adversely affect every piece of residential, as well as nonresidential, property in the District of Columbia.

Now it is incongruous to even think about a \$500 million nonresidential urban renewal program at a time when such a crying need for residential rehabilitation and improvement exists in the District of Columbia, and when archaic taxing philosophy promotes and perpetuates slums in our Nation's Capital.

Last June 27, 1963, I introduced a bill, H.R. 7319, to amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 to insure that Federal subsidies may not exceed the total cost of facilities provided by the District of Columbia as non-cash grants-in-aid. Under existing law the District of Columbia is permitted to receive Federal subsidies which exceed the total cost of facilities provided as noncash grants-in-aid to slum clearance and urban renewal projects. No other local community is in this same position. The Comptroller General of the United States in his audit of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency for